

United States Patent and Trademark Office

CIC

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/705,505	11/12/2003	Kenji Kawada	0032-0280P	0032-0280P 4761	
2292	7590 09/22/2005		EXAMINER		
BIRCH STE	EWART KOLASCH &	BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN			
	RCH, VA 22040-0743	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•		1624		

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applica	ion No	Applicant(s)				
		10/705,		KAWADA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary		Examine		Art Unit				
			raman Balasubramanian	1624				
	The MAILING DATE of this communi				255			
Period fo				••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	CRIENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSIO	AILING DATE OF T of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e unication. tutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the ap	THIS COMMUNICATION INVENT, however, may a reply be time will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from optication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
2a)⊠ 3)□	Since this application is in condition to	tb)☐ This action is for allowance excep	ot for formal matters, pro		erits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati	Claim(s) 9 is/are pending in the applitude 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict on Papers The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	e withdrawn from c tion and/or election e Examiner.	requirement.	Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔲 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTo-1449 or Foots) No(s)/Mail Date	ГО-948) РТО/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa		2)			

Application/Control Number: 10/705,505

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included cancellation of claims 1-8, 10 and amendment to claim 9, filed on 7/14/2005, is made of record. Claim 9 is now pending.

In view of applicants' response, the following rejection made in the previous office action is maintained.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 9 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 37, 40, 52, 56, 57, 75 and 76 -59, 74 and 76 of copending Application No. 09/214,277. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claim is also embraced in the copending earlier filed application 09/215,277. Note claims 40, 56-57 and 76 embrace the same immnosuppressor composition while claims 37, 52 and 75 embrace a pharmaceutical composition. A pharmaceutical composition is a pharmaceutical

Application/Control Number: 10/705,505

Art Unit: 1624

composition irrespective of its intended use or desirable property. Claim 9 is a composition claim with some attributes to the compound. These attributes do not change the composition and make it different from the composition of 37, 40, 52, 56, 57, 75 and 76 of copending Application No. 09/214,277.

See Intirtool, LTD. V. Texar Corp., 70 USPQ2D 1780. Note court held that "In general, a claim preamble is limiting if recites essential structure or steps or if it is necessary to give" life, meaning, and vitality to claim.'.... However, if the body of the claim describes a structurally complete invention such that deletion of the preamble phrase does not effect the structure or steps of the claimed invention,' the preamble is generally not limiting unless there is clear reliance on the preamble during prosecution to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.""

Instant claim is a composition claim and is clearly defined by a structure namely a terphenyl core with a side chain bearing specific substituents. Omission of the attributes to the composition of the compound of genus of claim 9 would not alter the structure of these compounds and hence the composition.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

This rejection is same as made in the previous office action except that it is limited to pending claim 9. This rejection is maintained as the above said copending application has been now allowed.

Claim 9 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of

copending Application No. 10/704,876. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claim is also embraced in the copending earlier filed application 10/704,876. A pharmaceutical composition is a pharmaceutical composition irrespective of its intended use or desirable property. Claim 9 and 10 are composition claims with some attributes to the compound. These attributes do not change the composition and make it different from the composition of claims 1 and 2 of the copending application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

This rejection is same as made in the previous office action except that it is limited to pending claim 9 and is maintained for reasons stated above, this application is not in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/705,505 Page 5

Art Unit: 1624

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be

addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571)

272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from

8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Acting Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624

is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0661. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-

8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

Venkutaramu Balasubammay Venkataraman Balasubramanian

9/20/2005